

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

DATE MAILED: 12/27/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,721	09/22/2003	Sek Chuen Chow	GJE-73D1	9693
23557 7590 12/27/2004			EXAMINER	
	IIK LLOYD & SAL	WARE, DEBORAH K		
A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION PO BOX 142950			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	E, FL 32614-2950		1651	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/667,721	CHOW ET AL.
Lxammer-indated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Deborah K. Ware	1651
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Deborah K. Ware</u> .	(3)	·
(2) <u>David R. Saliwanchik</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 23 December 2004	Time:	·
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ No	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: Only discussed a second action restriction requirement		·
Claims discussed: 1-6		
Prior art documents discussed: None discussed at this time		
Part II.		•
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.	,	
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summation 	he examiner will provide a write record of the substance of the	tten summary of the substance e interview, since the interview
Ollulok Way		
PATENT EXAMINER		·
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicar	nt/Applicant's Representative S	Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/667,721

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Ware agreed to recombine the product claims into one group in order to limit the restriction requirement to 3 groups in place of 4 groups. Group II: claims 1 and 6; Group II: claims 2-3; and Group III: claims 4-5. Applicants' Representative will respond to the restriction requirement in writing within the specified time period set forth in the requirement of December 15, 2004.